



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,062	12/02/2003	John G. DeSteele	E-1861	4870
32215 7590 06/16/2008 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET, SUITE 1600 ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER				
BARTON, JEFFREY THOMAS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/16/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/727,062

**Applicant(s)**

DESTEESE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jeffrey T. Barton

**Art Unit**

1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 31-50 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 39-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 31-38 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20071113, 20080227, 20080415  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The responses filed on 13 November 2007 and 24 March 2008 do not place the application in condition for allowance.

***Election/Restrictions***

2. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1, 5-7, and 31-38 in the reply filed on 24 March 2008 is acknowledged. Claims 39-50 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

***Status of Objections and Rejections Pending Since the  
Office Action of 14 June 2007***

3. All objections and rejections are withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment.

***Specification***

4. The amendment filed on 13 November 2007 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: there is no full support in the original disclosure of either the instant application or 10/726,744 for the following sentences: "It will be recognized by those skilled in the art that other embodiments may include multiple n-type thermoelements in parallel with

Art Unit: 1795

each other and in series with a single p-type thermoelement, or alternatively multiple n-type thermoelements in parallel with each other and in series with multiple p-type thermoelements. These and other embodiments would fall within the spirit and scope of the present disclosure."

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1, 5-7, and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in either the original specification of the instant application or the specification of 10/726,744 for a plurality of p-type thermoelements being connected in parallel to each other and in series to a plurality of n-type thermoelements as provided for in amended claim 1 at lines 23-25.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1, 5-7, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Migowski (WO 89/07836; citations below are to the English

translation provided on the IDS of 13 November 2007) in view of Bass et al. (US 6,207,887)

Regarding claim 1, Migowski discloses a method for providing power, comprising: providing a thermoelectric generator having a first end and a second end (Figures 2 and 4); exposing the first and second ends to two different temperature regions (Paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3, Paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5); utilizing a difference between the temperature regions to produce electric power; wherein the thermoelectric generator comprises a plurality of thermocouples comprising p-type and n-type thin film semiconductor thermoelements formed on a flexible substrate. (Paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 through the third full paragraph of page 3)

Regarding claims 5-7, Migowski teaches forming the p- and n-type thermocouples from Bi, Te, Sb, Se, or Pb. (3rd full paragraph of page 3) As bismuth telluride and other claimed compounds are conventional thermoelectric materials, selection of these known materials based on this listing would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 31-33, Migowski teaches preparing the generator on a single continuous flexible substrate and winding the substrate in a coil. (Paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 and the 1st full paragraph of page 3)

Migowski does not explicitly disclose a device with pluralities of thermoelements connected in series and parallel precisely as claimed.

Bass et al disclose a series-parallel connection scheme for a thermoelectric generator (Figure 13A; Column 6, lines 46-62) in which plural n-type elements are

Art Unit: 1795

connected electrically in parallel and are connected in series to a plurality of p-type elements that are connected to each other in parallel. Four thermoelements are present in each resulting couple.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Migowski by employing the series-parallel connection scheme of Bass et al, because Bass et al teach that such connection protects against complete power loss in the event of damage to a single thermoelement, thus providing increased reliability.

(Column 6, lines 46-62)

Regarding the limitation to power being generated "regardless of whether the first temperature region is warmer or cooler than the second temperature region", the Examiner's position is that any thermopile having hot and cold junctions will provide power regardless of which junction side has the higher temperature. Reversing the hot and cold sides results in reversal of the polarity of the output power, but power is generated in either case.

Regarding claim 33, as a spindle is a conventional means of aiding in coiling an elongated material, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the coiled generator of Migowski by winding it around a spindle, with the predictable result of production of the desired coiled generator. As a skilled artisan would have recognized that the semiconductor materials of the device are not ideally flexible, such a spindle would have also provided the expected advantage of preventing coiling the device with too small a diameter, thus preventing damage to the device.

Regarding claim 34, selection of element dimensions is considered to be a matter of design choice, depending upon the dimensions and gradient present in the installation site, substrate dimensions, desired number of junctions, desired voltage, among other considerations. In the absence of evidence of criticality, selection of length to area ratios as claimed is considered obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. Also note that in *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

11. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Migowski and Bass et al as applied to claims 1, 5-7, and 31-34 above, and further in view of Simeray et al. (US 6,340,787)

Migowski in view of Bass et al is relied upon for the reasons given above. Migowski et al suggest use of their thermoelectric generator for general "power supply units, etc." (Page 3, 6th full paragraph)

Neither Migowski nor Bass et al explicitly teaches the particular first and second temperature regions instantly claimed.

Simeray et al teach low-power thermoelectric generation using small temperature gradients, as used by Migowski et al, specifically teaching that the first and second



Art Unit: 1795

temperature regions can be the ground and the air above the ground (Figure 6; Column 6, lines 17-30) or air inside a building and air outside a building. (Figure 5, Column 6, lines 10-16)

Relevant to claim 36, in the ground/air embodiment, Simeray et al disclose a heat pipe (74) connected to the first end and buried in the ground. (Figure 6) Relevant to claim 37, Simeray et al disclose a second heat pipe (73) coupled to the second end. Such a "heat exchanger" and "thermal collection stake" read on the instant heat pipes, as they conduct heat to the respective hot and cold junctions.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the method of Migowski by employing the generators in locations such as between the ground and air, or in a wall of a building, as taught by Simeray, because Simeray teaches that such locations provide suitable temperature gradients for low power thermoelectric generators and Migowski suggests that his generators may be used generally in power supply units. Such a combination will provide the predictable result of successfully generating power.

Specific to claim 38, building interiors conventionally have HVAC systems having ducts. Therefore, the interior of the building comprises air inside ducts, while the exterior of the building comprises air outside of such ducts. The combination thus meets the limitations of the claim.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Jeffrey T. Barton whose telephone number is (571)272-1307. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

Art Unit: 1795

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JTB

4 June 2008

/Edna Wong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795